



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SV

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/114,962	07/14/98	BREED	D AJI-192
------------	----------	-------	-----------

022846
BRIAN ROFFE, ESQ
366 LONGACRE AVENUE
WOODMERE NY 11598

PM92/0119

EXAMINER

CULBRETH, E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3611

11

DATE MAILED: 01/19/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/114,962

Applicant(s)

Breed

Examiner

Eric Culbreth

Group Art Unit

3611



THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]

- a) ☒ expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

- ☒ Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on Jan 16, 2001 (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).

Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on Jan 16, 2001 has been considered with the following effect, but is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

- ☒ The proposed amendment(s):

☐ will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.

- ☒ will not be entered because:

☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).

☐ they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).

☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.

☐ they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: Combining claims 17 and 23 with 16 and 22 respectively raises new issues because claims 18-21, for instance, were dependent from claim 16 and not claim 17 (i.e., now, a rejection of claim 18, say, (see other)

- ☒ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):

112 rejections of claims 3 and 7

- ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.

- ☒ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Breed teaches away from frontal crush zone sensors, and Haviland in the combination would have the bags including the sensors in the bags, in positions away from the front crush zone

- ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

- ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):

Claims allowed: _____

Claims objected to: 8, 15, 20, and 25

Claims rejected: 1-7, 9-14, 16-19, 21-24, and 26-31

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the Examiner.

- ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

- ☒ Other has to also include the limitations of claim 17 as well as claim 16, whereas in the final rejection claim 18 did not include the limitations of claim 17; this raises new issues requiring further consideration and/or search).

Eric Culbreth
ERIC CULBRETH 1/18/01
PRIMARY EXAMINER